

Date: Tue, 29 Jun 93 01:05:42 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #209
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 29 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 209

Today's Topics:

 Field Day Question (4 msgs)
 NJ Tells Tandy, don't sell 800MHz scanners in NJ.
 NQ0I: What I would do.
 NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 28 Jun 93 15:36:37 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: Field Day Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun27.203848.12703@serval.net.wsu.edu> i7994779@wsuaix.csc.wsu.edu
(Patrick D. Walters) writes:

>this was my first FD ever as a new HAM, I had a great time working the station

>at W7BI in W Washington. It was especially fun since it was the first time I had
>had ever been on the air!!!!

Glad you had a great time, welcome aboard.

>My question is this: Can you work a station on the same band different mode
>and count it as a 2 FD contacts? Sat USB and FM on 2mtrs. Is that ok?
>I wasn't sure, but the station I was contacting said it was a dup. Does anyone
>ou there know for sure. The people I was operating with said it would have been
ok.

SSB, FM (as well as AM) all count as "voice" You can work the same station on the same band using voice and CW and then that counts as 2 separate contacts on TWO bands. For the band count, CW is treated as one band and voice as another.

Good question and the only reason I knew the answer was because I reread the FD rules last night :-)

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1993 15:54:30 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!
n4tii@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Field Day Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

i7994779@wsuaix.csc.wsu.edu (Patrick D. Walters) writes:

>this was my first FD ever as a new HAM, I had a great time working the station
>at W7BI in W Washington. It was especially fun since it was the first time I had
>had ever been on the air!!!!

>My question is this: Can you work a station on the same band different mode
>and count it as a 2 FD contacts? Sat USB and FM on 2mtrs. Is that ok?
>I wasn't sure, but the station I was contacting said it was a dup. Does anyone
>ou there know for sure. The people I was operating with said it would have been
ok.

Hi Patrick, I've often wondered the same thing...we had a few guys that told us we were dupes also...since we worked him on 40 and 80!

The way I've always interpreted the uJus was that if you work him on 80 then turn around and work him on 40 then you get 2 contacts... I am pretty sure this is the correct way...and if so, the idiot that has been scoring our club's contacts has been screwing it up!

Later.

John Reed, N4TII curious!

n4tii%kd4nc.uucp@gatech.edu

>kb7VP0

>Patrick Walters

Date: Tue, 29 Jun 93 02:55:09 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!

csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!

zaniah.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Field Day Question

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun27.203848.12703@serval.net.wsu.edu> i7994779@wsuaix.csc.wsu.edu
(Patrick D. Walters) writes:

>this was my first FD ever as a new HAM, I had a great time working the station

>at W7BI in W Washington. It was especially fun since it was the first time I had
>had ever been on the air!!!!

>

>My question is this: Can you work a station on the same band different mode

>and count it as a 2 FD contacts? Sat USB and FM on 2mtrs. Is that ok?

>I wasn't sure, but the station I was contacting said it was a dup. Does anyone

>ou there know for sure. The people I was operating with said it would have been
ok.

You need to read the rules as published in the May 1993 QST. Read them
a couple of times, and then carefully look at the way each station is scored.
For example, the paragraph permitting a packet only station mentions that
contacts from the one "free" packet only station count as if they are on
a separate band and therefore do not dupe to CW QSOs with the same station
on the same ham band. This is explicitly spelled out.

I haven't looked at the satellite station rules, but it may say that
all satellite QSOs count as if they are on a different band than FM.

Hey, Field Days are always really loose. Everybody interprets or understands
the rules a little differently, and some people don't even bother to
read them.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *

* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *

* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer

*

* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Tue, 29 Jun 93 06:44:19 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!caen!usenet.coe.montana.edu!netnews.nwnet.net!serval!
wsuaix.csc.wsu.edu!i7994779@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Field Day Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun29.025509.130467@locus.com> dana@zaniah.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>
>You need to read the rules as published in the May 1993 QST. Read them
>a couple of times, and then carefully look at the way each station is scored.
>For example, the paragraph permitting a packet only station mentions that
>contacts from the one "free" packet only station count as if they are on
>a separate band and therefore do not dupe to CW QSOs with the same station
>on the same ham band. This is explicitly spelled out.
>
>I haven't looked at the satellite station rules, but it may say that
>all satellite QSOs count as if they are on a different band than FM.
>
>Hey, Field Days are always really loose. Everybody interprets or understands
>the rules a little differently, and some people don't even bother to
>read them.
>
>--
> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are
*
> * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

I hadn't read them either!! I don't get QST YET. In fact I don't even have radio
YET, that's why FD was so fun for me!!

=====
Patrick D. Walters Washington State University
i7994779@wsuaix.csc.wsu.edu NW Collegiate Cycling Conference Director
Voice at (unavailable) KB7VPO
=====

Date: 28 Jun 93 16:10:19 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: NJ Tells Tandy, don't sell 800MHz scanners in NJ.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I post this to both rec.radio.amateur.policy and .misc to let folks know what is happening. PLEASE direct all replies to the .policy newsgroup only.

Thanks,
Bill K2UNK

In article <1993Jun28.141810.23396@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:
>In article <C97H2r.1Ez@scr.siemens.com> pjd@scr.siemens.com (dr. funk) writes:
>>
>>Although I am fearful for the precedent which it will set for
>>our rights....
>>
>>I'm always amused at the bo-zoids in the NJ assembly who act
>>like Pennsylvania and New York are distant planets. I will merely
>>buy my electronics in PA and NY, and they will be happy to take
>>the sale tax to the treasury.
>>paul j. drongowski N20QT
>
>Don't blame the NJ legislature for this one. This action (see page
>1 of today's Star Ledger 6/28) is strictly the work of the beaurocrats
>in Florio's attorney general's office. The law (NJ Wiretap Act) is
>no different than the federal ECPA which the FCC fully understands does
>NOT prohibit scanners that can receive cellular.
>
>The NJ situation is strictly an interpretation (absolutly wrong) which
>the AG's office is enforcing at this time ONLY against Tandy's
>double conversion 800 MHz scanners. Tandy can still sell their
>triple conversion 800 MHz units which everyone knows can be readily
>modified to receive cellular.
>
>If you're outraged, call your elected representatives and tell them the
>state is wasting your taxpayer \$\$\$ trying to enforce something that
>is (1) unenforceable and (2) does nothing to eliminate the scanners as
>they can be readily purchased by mail order or just by going to
>any of the other 49 states.
>
>Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.
>-----
>Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
>Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
>201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1993 14:07:52 GMT

Antenna towers are of varying heights, but heights near halfwave are a bitch to base feed. If you can shunt feed the tower, it's viable, WLAW uses this technique in a single tower non-directional station. Usually, in multi-tower arrays, the tower heights are not uniform. There are often quarterwave and 5/8 wave towers in the mix. This is very pattern and site dependent. It's fairly safe to say that every directional installation is a custom job. The simple idealized designs seen in books rarely meet performance specs at a given site. The deciding factors are actual field strength readings at the monitoring points, and mechanical considerations at the site.

Gary

--

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| Gary Coffman KE4ZV | | You make it, | | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary |
| Destructive Testing Systems | | we break it. | | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary |
| 534 Shannon Way | | Guaranteed! | | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary |
| Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | | | | |

Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1993 15:59:37 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!

squam.banyan.com!banyan.com!dts@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <POPOVICH.93Jun25111809@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>,

<C96xM0.7J1@news.cso.uiuc.edu>, <20fstdINN3na@crcnis1.unl.edu>a

Subject : Re: Presence of control operator

In article <20fstdINN3na@crcnis1.unl.edu>, mcduffie@unl.edu (Gary McDuffie Sr) writes:

|> freeman@eagle.sangamon.edu (Jay Freeman) writes:

|>

|> >Steve Popovich (popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com) wrote:

|> >> >Yes, the non-extra is considered a third party. That means no contacts

|> >> >with DX countries that the US doesn't have a third-party agreement with.

|> >> >The control operator must be present and monitoring the transmissions.

|> >> >For our group, the control operator usually acts as the logger -- that

|> >> >should easily meet the FCC requirements, since the logger is intimately

|> >> >aware of everything that is going on.

|> >>

|> >> So how does this work for stations in gigantic FD categories like 15A,

|> >> operating with a single call sign? The Extra can't be at every

|> >> operating position, monitoring and controlling every transmission. It

|> >> seems that either this makes multi-transmitter contest stations

|> >> illegal, or we're missing something here.

|> >> -Steve

|>

|> >No, it means that each op has to stay within his or her license's priveleges,
|> >*unless* a higher class licensee sits down with them as control op.
|>
|> >73,
|> >Jay
|>
|> The League better get the word out then...because every club I have
|> ever been to FD with let even novices operate any mode, any freq,

Better read your QST articles more carefully. This was all spelled out in QST
both this year and last around FD time.

|> saying it was legal because the extra class op was on the premises. He
|> may have been asleep, at another operating position, or filling the
|> generator. But he was considered there. Most clubs seem to operate
|> under the blanket of one license, letting all positions have the highest
|> privileges.
|>
|> 73, Gary

It is NOT clear that a licensed ham, operating with control op. outside of normal
privileges becomes "3rd Party". Reading the definition of 3rd party from various
sources leads me to believe that 3rd party indicates an UNLICENSED person. Not
unlicensed on a particular band/mode/whatever. NTS traffic is passed for ANY
licensed ham to ANY OTHER licensed ham in the world, regardless of the license
class of the two hams (sending and receiving). The 3rd party agreements cover
traffic which is either sent by, or received by an unlicensed individual. The
traffic message is carried over many different emission types on different bands,
possibly some that the hams at either end are not licensed for.

Dan

--

Daniel Senie Internet: dts@banyan.com
Banyan Systems, Inc. CompuServe: 74176,1347
508-898-1188 Packet Radio: N1JEB@WA1PHY.MA

Date: 28 Jun 93 18:54:39 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
wjturner@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C96xM0.7J1@news.cso.uiuc.edu>, <20fstdINN3na@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<C9C9rD.6Kv@squam.banyan.com>urn
Subject : Re: Presence of control operator

In article <C9C9rD.6Kv@squam.banyan.com> dts@banyan.com (Daniel Senie) writes:
>It is NOT clear that a licensed ham, operating with control op. outside of normal
>privileges becomes "3rd Party". Reading the definition of 3rd party from various
>sources leads me to believe that 3rd party indicates an UNLICENSED person. Not
>unlicensed on a particular band/mode/whatever. NTS traffic is passed for ANY
>licensed ham to ANY OTHER licensed ham in the world, regardless of the license
>class of the two hams (sending and receiving). The 3rd party agreements cover
>traffic which is either sent by, or received by an unlicensed individual. The
>traffic message is carried over many different emission types on different bands,
>possibly some that the hams at either end are not licensed for.

I haven't checked, but I would agree that it isn't spelled out all that
clearly. However, it would probably be wise to go on the assumption that
a licensed ham can be a third party, at least until someone is able to get
some confirmation one way or another.

--
Will Turner, N0RDV -----
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: Tue, 29 Jun 1993 00:06:35 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!csus.edu!netcom.com!feustel@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C97H2r.1Ez@scr.siemens.com>,
<1993Jun28.141810.23396@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<1993Jun28.161019.25628@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: NJ Tells Tandy, don't sell 800MHz scanners in NJ.

New Jersey is just competing for the number one position in the list
of U.S. Police States.

--
Dave Feustel N9MYI <feustel@netcom.com>

FREE! FREE!!! THANK GOD ALMIGHTY! FREE AT LAST!

Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1993 23:27:11 GMT
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!csc.ti.com!tilde.csc.ti.com!m2.dseg.ti.com!ernest!
cmptrc!carter@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun24.180452.24730@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,

<C95CCo.I8D@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, <POPOVICH.93Jun25111809@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>
Subject : Re: Presence of control operator

In article <POPOVICH.93Jun25111809@cyclades.ma30.bull.com>
popovich@cyclades.ma30.bull.com (Steve Popovich) writes:
>So how does this work for stations in gigantic FD categories like 15A,
>operating with a single call sign? The Extra can't be at every
>operating position, monitoring and controlling every transmission. It
>seems that either this makes multi-transmitter contest stations
>illegal, or we're missing something here.

No - that's to confuse the station licensee with the control operator.
In this situation, or in the situation of a club station using a club call,
the call sign holder is not the control operator. Remember, call signs
correspond to stations, not operators. The control operator is a licensed
operator who is supervising the station operation.

In the example you cite, the Extra-call-holder is the station licensee.
He or she is not acting as the control operator. There will be a control
operator for every control point, whether it is the Extra or someone else.
These control operators must never exceed the privileges granted to them
by their operator license.

At our FD installation just this year, I operated at a station using the
extra class callsign K5SLD. I hold an Advanced-Class license, so I had
to stay within Advanced class operations. While I was operating, a ham
with a Tech+ license came by, and I logged while he turned the knobs and
made contacts. Be aware, however, that I was still the station operator,
and the Tech+'s license was never used, even though he participated!
Here's how it works:

The rules state that the control operator be present at the control point,
except for specific exceptions, such as stations in repeater operation. I
would not advise taking too many liberties with the definition of "present."
But since the burden of ensuring correct operation falls on both the station
licensee and the control operator, it is proper for them to determine what
degree of control they need to impose.

Date: (null)
From: (null)

This will be third-party involvement! The information transmitted is
originating from a person who is not the station licensee or control
operator, so there are a few technicalities involved here, but many
(such as some call-sign procedures) have been relaxed in recent years.
Be sure to familiarize yourself with them before going in for this type
of operation, but don't let them discourage you.

--

Carter R. Bennett, Jr. - Scientist | "Oh my God! I _AM_ a nerd!!!"
carter@scilab.lonestar.org - home | - C. Bennett, Sept 25, 1992, after
carter@cmptrc.lonestar.org - work | realizing he had been talking about
KI5SR | "market availability of preconfigured Toll-House cookies."

Date: 28 Jun 93 11:39:14 GMT
From: bu.edu!att!cbnewsk!n8afd@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C90suq.18z@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>, <C956Gz.2r@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>,
<steveWC993yF.HDJ@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: First Amendment and NQ0I was Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

Forget the amateur rights for now, what about some poor hapless
person who wants to get rid of ***expensive*** cable TV, that
person can't even exercise their right to install a TV antenna.
This issue of antennas is a denial of a persons right to information,
perhaps its a forced monopoly caused by the cable tv companies.....

Date: Mon, 28 Jun 93 17:31:59 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun23.162055.2549@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Jun24.181224.14042@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Jun27.054747.17393@ke4zv.uucp>nfo
Subject : Re: NQ0I Case : HF Vertical Antennas

In article <1993Jun27.054747.17393@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
writes:

>Having some experience with falling towers, ice loaded 1000 footers, I
>can say that they generally don't fall like trees.

Having grown up in Northern Minnesota, where we had *real* winters, I beg to
differ. Remember, the tower base is the focus of the longest wind moment arm,
so it's the most likely to fault. Maybe it's just that the most common metal
defect at subzero temperatures is crystal fracture. But I recall all of them
snapping at the foot.

>Well bending resistance is a function of cross sectional area, and an
>open lattice structure presents less wind resistance than a solid tube.

You're neglecting turbulence effects, which would make the effective cross sectional area of the tower close to the box area. You can also sleeve the dipoles over fiberglass rod for extra strength.

>Your center of radiation is only 15 feet above ground in that case and near
>field objects, including ground, are going to play hell with the pattern as
>well as absorbing large amounts of power.

Given the typical suburban ranch home environment, that's sufficient. Yes, proximity to ground will absorb about the lowest 5 degrees of radiation, but that's also much the case with horizontal beams, and the lowest 5 degrees doesn't help you that much in any event.

Going from 30' to 60' buys you a little more than one S Unit. Is it really worth it?

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1993 11:34:07 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!cbnewsk!n8afd@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <randall.740849440@woof>, <C956Gz.2r@cbnewsk.cb.att.com>,
<john.741024780@misty>
Subject : Re: First Amendment and NQ0I was Re: Childish posts on the NQ01 case:

If a person can exercise his free speech rights by burning an U.S. flag, is see no reasons why a amateur should be kept from exercising their free speech rights by erecting a tower. Again, I say that amateurs are being held to what a previous post has called a "double standard".

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #209
